

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of all grounds of rejection in the Office Action, and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 2-12, are now pending herein, and claims 11 and 12 have been added hereby. Claim 11 is supported by FIG. 2 and at least in the specification at page 3, lines 5-8, and claim 12 is supported at least in the specification at page 4, lines 11-14. Claim 5 has been amended to depend from new claim 11.

At the outset, Applicant notes with appreciation the indication in the Office Action that claims 2-4 and 6-10 recite allowable subject matter.

Claims 1 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of Okada (JP11164226A). Applicant respectfully traverses this ground of rejection for the reasons indicated herein below.

Claim 11 recites that means for adjusting the step AGC amplifier only during the vertical synchronization interval, and includes a gate for connecting a step-controlling signal to the step AGC amplifier only during a pulse width of a vertical synchronization pulse. As shown in the example FIG. 2, the gate 8 only connects the clock generator 7 to the step AGC amplifier during the pulse width of the v-synch signal, which as shown in FIG. 2, controls the opening and closing of the gate 8.

In contrast to the claimed invention, Okada, as best determined by the translation provided by the Examiner, adjusts an AGC during the vertical synchronization and compensates for current leakage at the end of AGC capacitor 5 by compensating for

fluctuation of the AGC voltage for a period other than the vertical synchronization signal. Okada fails to disclose a means for adjusting the step AGC that includes a gate that connects a step-controlling signal to the step AGC. Furthermore, Okada suffers from leakage which is problem with Gilbert cells. Moreover, the translation does not disclose that Okada discloses a step AGC, merely an AGC.

In accordance with MPEP 2131, under 35 U.S.C. §102, according to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, a “claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference” (*Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (emphasis added)). Therefore, to reject a feature, which is alleged to patentably distinguish the claim containing such feature, as being anticipated by a prior art, the Office Action must establish that the same feature is present in the cited reference. As Okada fails to disclose each and every element as set forth in claims 5, 11 and 12, these claims are not anticipated by the reference.

Nor would the combined recitation of elements, as recited in independent claim 11, have been obvious at the time of invention as being within the ordinary level of skill in the art (*KSR International v. Teleflex*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007)).

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5 is allowable at least for dependency from claim 11, which is believed allowable for the reasons previously indicated, and because of a separate basis for patentability. Claim 12 is depends from allowed claim 2.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all grounds of rejection in the Office Action are overcome, and the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
Richard Stokey

Date: November 17, 2008

By: /Steve Cha/  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 44,069

**Mail all correspondence to:**

Aaron Waxler, Registration No. 48,027  
NXP, B.V.  
NXP Intellectual Property Department  
M/S41-SJ  
1109 McKay Drive  
San Jose, CA 95131  
Phone: (408) 434-3000  
Fax: (408) 474-9081